REMARKS

Claims 4 and 6-16 are pending in the application. Claim 5 has been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because it recites the limitation "said frame" in lines 9 and 10.

Claim 4 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 4 would be allowable if amended to overcome the Section 112 rejection.

As stated in the foregoing, claim 4 has been amended to overcome the Section 112 rejection. Therefore, Applicants believe that claim 4 is now in condition for allowance.

Applicants also appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 11-16 are allowed and also that claims 6-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 6 has been amended to independent form including all of the limitations of independent claim 5 to place claim 6 in condition for allowance.

Claims 7-10, variously dependent on claim 6, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 6.

A favorable determination and allowance of claims 4 and 6-16 is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Beauchamp et al. (USP 5,835,108). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 has been canceled, thus rendering this rejection moot.

In view of this, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Request for Initialed Form(s) PTO-1449

Applicant notes that an initialed Form PTO-1449 for the Information Disclosure Statement dated <u>March 29, 2002</u> accompanied the Office Action of September 17, 2003.

However, as noted by Applicant in the previous reply filed on June 17, 2003, the appropriate initialed Form PTO-1449 in response to the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on March 6, 2002 has not been received by Applicant.

The Examiner is therefore requested to return a copy of the initialed Form PTO-1449 dated March 6, 2002 to the undersigned as soon as possible. A copy of the Form PTO-1449 dated March 6, 2002 is attached to this Reply for the Examiner's reference.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims in the present application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Reply After Final in that it raises no new issues. Alternatively, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Reply After Final in that it places the application in better form for Appeal.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (Reg. No. 40,417) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

TCB:MH/mh:pjh 0965-0372P P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment: copy of March 6, 2003 Form PTO-1449